

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8 MARTA D. LYALL,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 BANK OF AMERICA, et al.,

12 Defendants.

CASE NO. C19-1506RSM

MINUTE ORDER

13
14 The following MINUTE ORDER is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable
15 Ricardo S. Martinez, Chief United States District Judge:

16 This matter was filed in state court before being removed to this Court. Plaintiff has filed
17 what the Court interpreted as a motion to remand, and two defendants have filed motions to
18 dismiss.¹— Dkts. #6, #10, and #12. All the motions are still being briefed.

19 On September 27, 2019, Plaintiff made several filings in this case. Dkts. #17–21. As
20 best the Court can tell, two of the documents filed by Plaintiff appear to be identical copies of
21 the notice of removal that was filed in state court. Dkts. #18 and #19. Plaintiff provides no
22
23

24

¹ The remaining defendant seeks joinder on one motion to dismiss. Dkt. #14.

1 explanation of the filings and none is evident to the Court. Accordingly, the Court will not
2 consider the filings (Dkts. #18 and #19) and, to the extent necessary, STRIKES them.

3 Two of Plaintiffs filings also appear almost identical. Plaintiff filed two copies of a
4 document entitled: "Plaintiff's Request for the Court to Take Judicial Notice." Dkts. #17 and
5 #20. The second filing appears to add several paragraphs to the end of the document and attaches
6 additional documents that are omitted from the first filing. Accordingly, the Court will not
7 consider the first filing (Dkt. #17) and, to the extent necessary, STRIKES it.

8 As to Plaintiff's remaining Request for the Court to Take Judicial Notice (Dkt. #20), the
9 filing appears intended to alert the Court that Plaintiff received inadequate notice of the striking
10 of a previously scheduled preliminary injunction hearing. Dkt. #20 at 1. Beyond that, the filing
11 appears intended to further argue that removal of this case was improper. Plaintiff does not
12 provide the Court with an explanation of why it needs such notice and does not provide any legal
13 basis for the notice. FED. R. CIV. P. 7(b)(1)(B), (C) (motion must "state with particularity the
14 grounds for seeking the order[,] and [] state the relief sought"); *Garner v. Morales*, 237 F.R.D.
15 399, 400 (S.D. Tex. 2006) (motion must establish necessity of relief it seeks). Accordingly, the
16 Court will not consider the filing (Dkt. #20) and, to the extent necessary, STRIKES it as
17 procedurally improper.

18 Finally, the Court addresses Plaintiff's Notice Correcting Cover Sheet Incorrectly Filed
19 by Defendant. Dkt. #21. Plaintiff apparently seeks to have the Court make certain changes to
20 the civil cover sheet filed by Defendant First American Title Insurance Company. Plaintiff also
21 attaches a copy of her motion to remand. As with Plaintiff's other filing, the Notice Correcting
22 Cover Sheet does not provide a legal basis and does not make clear the importance of the relief
23 requested. FED. R. CIV. P. 7(b)(1)(B), (C) (motion must "state with particularity the grounds for
24 seeking the order[,] and [] state the relief sought"); *Garner v. Morales*, 237 F.R.D. 399, 400 (S.D.

1 Tex. 2006) (motion must establish necessity of relief it seeks). Accordingly, the Court will not
2 consider the filing (Dkt. #21) and, to the extent necessary, STRIKES it as procedurally improper.
3 To the extent the filing seeks to support her motion to remand, Plaintiff's rely is her opportunity
4 to further support her motion.

5 Dated this 30 day of September 2019.

6 WILLIAM McCOOL, Clerk

7
8 By: /s/ Paula McNabb
9 Deputy Clerk
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24